Present: Greg Wright, Kevin VandeWall, Evelyn Halterman, Lesa Quinn, Joel Lunde, Larry Murphy, Mark Brandsgard, Rich Jacobs (partial meeting)

Absent: Steve Mosena, Keith Greiner, Roberta Polzin, Gary Kendell

Guests: Greg Fay, Lorrie Tritch, John Hove, John Gillispie, Diane Van Zante (recorder), Lana Morrissey, RJ Hellstern, Mark Uhrin, Michael Tutty

1. **Call to Order** – Greg Wright.
   Greg Wright, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. It was noted that a quorum of members was in attendance.

2. **Approve Minutes of May 13, 2008** – Greg Wright.
   Larry Murphy moved approval of the May 13, 2008 meeting minutes; Joel Lunde seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the minutes as written.

3. **Updated Budgets for FY10 Utilities**
   a. Common Directory
   In the previous version of the budget (distributed at the May meeting), total utility budgeted expenses for FY10 were $157,142, resulting in a potential FY10 rate of 58 cents per person per month or $6.96 per person per year.   The updated budget shows total utility budgeted expenses for FY10 of $194,523. The increase is due primarily to ITE rate changes which take effect on July 1, 2008, specifically the Consulting E-mail Senior hourly rate. Utilizing the new budget figures, the FY10 rate is approximately 69.68 cents per person per month or $8.36 per person per year.

   b. Information Security Office (ISO) – Greg Fay.
   In the previous version of the budget (distributed at the May meeting), the potential FY10 rate was $1.24 per person per month or $14.89 per person per year. Utilizing the new budget figures, the FY10 rate is approximately $1.20 per person per month or $14.45 per person per year. The total ISO budget for FY10 is $328,991 and supports two positions as well as the basic needs for those positions. The proposed rate assumes the same agency participation as the last two years. Sophos is not included in the FY10 budget and has never been part of the ISO budget. Sophos is a marketplace service.

4. **Approve Tentative Rate Methodologies for FY10 Utilities**
   a. Common Directory
   Historically, we have used similar language as that detailed below. In addition, Mollie Anderson asked that customer councils include some verbiage in regard to the transition of council activities to the Department of Management.

Proposed wording of motion: *The Technology Customer Council approves a Directory Services rate methodology for FY10 based upon budgeted expenses of $194,522.58 and a divisor of full-time/part-time personnel as of the 3rd quarter of FY 2008. These tentatively approved rates will be opened to the customary 30-day comment period in July and referred to the Department of Management and the new customer council to finalize.*

Rich Jacobs moved approval of the aforementioned language; Joel Lunde seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the rate methodology.

b. Information Security Office
Proposed wording of motion: *The Technology Customer Council approves an Information Security Office rate methodology for FY10 based upon budgeted expenses of $328,990.65 and a divisor of full-time/part-time personnel as of the 3rd quarter of FY 2008. These tentatively approved rates will be opened to the customary 30-day comment period in July and referred to the Department of Management and the new customer council to finalize.*

Rich Jacobs moved approval of the aforementioned language; Joel Lunde seconded the motion. Discussion: Some council members were under the impression that Sophos was part of the ISO budget. Sophos has not been a responsibility of the Information Security Office in the time that it has been a utility; there has never been any money in the ISO budget for Sophos. Larry Murphy reported that he will be recommending to the Judicial Branch that they not participate in the ISO utility in FY09, but spend the money on Sophos instead. The FY09 and FY10 figures are based on Judicial's participation.

An oral vote was taken; Larry Murphy voted against the proposal, all others voted to approve the rate methodology.

5. **Preliminary Budgets for New Utilities**
    a. Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)
    An updated budget was distributed, containing an additional column on tab 6. Overall budget assumptions: Direct costs of this service are accounted for in fund 0123, org 6112. The SOA utility will be charged for all services provided by ITE for the operation of the SOA and includes networking support and management and governance of the architecture. The divisor will make use of the most recent quarter count to compute rate per billable FTE and bill departments based upon the last quarter number of FTEs.

    Has a business plan been developed? Not at the present time, but we do have some descriptions of scope and intended use. Is a business plan needed before the Council approves a rate methodology? Probably not, however ITE should create a business plan in the near future.

    Two budgets have been formulated, one requiring the purchase of new equipment, the other using CJIS (Criminal Justice Information Systems) existing equipment.

Assuming purchase of new equipment, based on a budget of $132,723.77, the rate would be 56 cents per person per month or $6.67 per person per year.

Assuming use of existing equipment, based on a budget of $39,723.77, the rate would be 17 cents per person per month or $2.00 per person per year.

b. Authentication and Authorization (A & A)
Overall budget assumptions: Direct costs of this service are accounted for in fund 0123, org 6112. The A & A utility will be charged for all services provided by ITE for the operation of the A & A and includes everything from application server hosting to service desk support.   The divisor will make use of the most recent quarter count to compute rate per billable FTE and bill departments based upon the last quarter number of FTEs.

Two budgets have been prepared, one using total FTEs from those agencies required to participate, the other using FTEs from agencies required to participate plus those that currently use the service. Unlike the SOA budget, the A & A budget is based on actual amounts over the past year.

Assuming required participation only, based on a budget of $163,594.49, the rate would be 69 cents per person per month or $8.22 per person per year.

Assuming all agencies that currently use the service, based on a budget of $163,594.49, the rate would be 61 cents per person per month or $7.32 per person per year.

6. **Discuss Rate Methodologies for New Utilities**
   a. Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)
      Discussion points:
      - What is the status of talks with CJIS? Discussions are ongoing; the issues are not yet resolved, but the right people are involved in the process.
      - Veterans' Home (IVH) staff has not been able to get their arms around this. Michael Tutty will forward information to the IVH CIO.
      - Agencies may not understand how this effort impacts them or how they benefit. This will be one of those utility services that you pay for, but don't see a benefit unless you take advantage of it.
      - Can you project expenses in year two? Michael does not foresee an increase in expenses. The worst case scenario is a need to double the capacity, meaning the purchase of additional boxes. This would only result from an uncommon increase in traffic.
      - What about the service bus? That is not part of the initial plan. We will host some shared service components; agencies may choose to host their data on one of those shared components.
      - How do we know which rate methodology we're voting on?

      Rich Jacobs moved adoption of wording similar to previous motions, utilizing the phrase "$132,000 or lesser amount if it can be accomplished." If stated in full, that motion would read:

The Technology Customer Council approves a Service Oriented Architecture rate methodology for FY10 based upon budgeted expenses of $132,000 or lesser amount if it can be accomplished and a divisor of full-time/part-time personnel as of the 3rd quarter of FY 2008. These tentatively approved rates will be opened to the customary 30-day comment period in July and referred to the Department of Management and the new customer council to finalize.

Joel Lunde seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the rate methodology.

b. Authentication and Authorization (A & A)
   Discussion Points:
   - A business plan is needed.
   - IVH would like to see an exemption or waiver process for agencies that have spent large sums of money on software for existing systems. There is a standard in place that already contains that language. This utility is forward looking; agencies would not be required to alter existing systems.
   - If an agency gets a waiver, are they still going to be charged for A & A? The answer is likely yes.
   - ITE has concrete plans to address Workforce Development (IWD) issues in the near future (to deal with the root cause of major problems).
   - If A & A is a utility, the ITE service desk should take the trouble calls, not the IWD service desk. If someone is having trouble with a sign-on, it should go to the provider, ITE. It needs to be part of the utility service. The help desk issue is the biggest deterrent to this utility.
   - Part of the issue is where to draw the line. There needs to be something that defines the level of service. It is unfair to ask the utility to bear the cost of the help desk. There is no synergy when everyone has their own help desk. We need to help the customer make good choices.
   - If we need to have a better set of terms and conditions about what types of calls ITE handles, we need to work on that. If calls increase exponentially, the Council will have to wrestle with the additional costs.
   - This will be one of the harder sells because not all agencies plan to use it or do not believe the service level is really there.
   - This should be a transactional based utility, rather than having everyone pay for it upfront.
   - I am not opposed to the utility, but am concerned with the methodology for the rates. A rate based solely on FTEs would be unfair to some agencies. A rate based on FTEs and transactions would be much preferred.
   - The methodology is up to the customer council to decide. Council members seem to favor a combined rate structure, comprised of both a flat rate and a usage rate.

   Based on discussion, there are at least three possible methods:
   1) Fee based solely on FTEs

2) Flat fee per agency with the remaining portion being transactional (increases would only be borne by those who have transactions)
3) Flat fee per agency with the remainder being transactional where the transactional portion consists of 50% of the overall cost (increases would be passed on to both the flat fee and transactional components).

The Council asked DAS/ITE to present possible scenarios for review and discussion at the next meeting. Because the rate setting process timeline calls for approval of tentative rates by the end of June, another meeting will be scheduled later this month. Council members suggested the meeting be conducted via conference call. Larry Murphy asked if ITE could outline business plans for SOA and A & A by the next meeting.

7. **Wrap-Up and Next Meeting Date –** Greg Wright.
Greg reported that the Department of Management (DOM) held an outbriefing for customer council chairs to talk about the customer council experience. DOM is considering having 13-15 agencies on the new, combined council and creating permanent or ad hoc subcommittees. No decisions have been made about who will serve on the Council, but they will likely retain the idea of representation from small, medium, and large agencies.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:16 p.m.